

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
February 3, 2016**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:00 P.M., in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Guarino, Chair and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Salas, Laffoon, Grube

ABSENT:

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

-Public input regarding solar panels and sustainability - February 17, 2016

- Citizens to be heard

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| 1. Case No. 2016-024 | 155 E COMMERCE ST |
| 2. Case No. 2016-476 | 227/207/213/219/223 4 TH ST, 120 & 118 TAYLOR ST |
| 3. Case No. 2016-045 | 150 E HOUSTON ST |
| 4. Case No. 2016-050 | 204 ALAMO PLAZA |
| 5. Case No. 2016-034 | 233 W MISTLETOE |
| 6. Case No. 2016-464 | 639 MISSION ST |
| 7. Case No. 2016-039 | 103 CALLAGHAN AVE |
| 8. Case No. 2016-043 | 2809 BROADWAY |

Items #1 & #6 were pulled from consent for citizens to be heard.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve the remaining consent agenda with staff stipulations

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Salas, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

1. HDRC NO. 2016-024

Applicant: Crockett Urban Ventures

Address: 155 E COMMERCE ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to:

1. Demolish the structure at 161 E Commerce commonly known as the Sullivan Building, the Alamo Savings Building and the MIC Building.
2. Construct a new 24 level hotel tower at the corner of E Commerce and N St. Mary's Street that retains the building at 155 E Commerce, commonly known as the Dwyer Building and the Fishmarket Building. At approximately 250' in height with 137,927 square feet, the hotel will feature 197 rooms and restaurant and retail space.

FINDINGS:

General findings:

- a. Conceptual approval was granted on January 21, 2015, for the demolition of the Sullivan Bank Building, also known as the Alamo Savings Association and MIC (Mortgage Investment Company), the rehabilitation of the

Dwyer building and the construction of an eighteen story hotel tower to address the corner of S St Mary's and E Commerce. At that hearing, conceptual approval was approved with the following stipulations; that the applicant provide a salvaging plan for incorporation of historic materials that are indicative of the history of the Sullivan Building into the proposed development and that the applicant return to the Design Review Committee to resolve certain aspects of the new construction including, but not limited to lighting design, street and river level façade arrangement, the placement of mechanical and service equipment.

Findings related to request item #1:

b. A request for the restoration of the Dwyer Building was reviewed again by the Design Review Committee on August 25, 2015. At that meeting, committee members agreed that the proposal would allow for joint correction at the corner with the Esquire. There were no issues as long as the restoration was executed properly and in accordance with the Historic Design Guidelines and the Unified Development Code.

c. On December 15, 2015, an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness was issued for the approval of a proposed restoration process for the Dwyer Building's façade which is to coincide with the construction of the proposed hotel tower to the immediate south of the historic structure.

d. In accordance with the administratively approved restoration process, the applicant has provided dimensioned architectural drawings has proposed to document the facade by photography (photos have not been submitted), and has proposed to generate a drawing from those photos and to provide a map to re-assemble the façade. The applicant has also proposed to properly pin the Dutchmen by ensuring a good bond and alignment, to have the samples be repaired and re-dressed by a mason and to construct a new stone wall the same thickness as above at the first floor where it is currently filled with rough cut rubble veneer. Staff notes that any Dutchmen that are to be fabricated and installed to the building's façade must be approved by staff collectively prior to their installation.

e. 159 - 161 E Commerce, which was at one time known as 301 – 303 W Commerce, commonly known as the Sullivan Building, Alamo Savings Association and the MIC (Mortgage Investment Corporation) Building is a local historic Landmark.

f. The demolition of the Sullivan Building originally received conceptual approval based on unreasonable economic hardship on December 16, 2009. That original status expired and the applicant received conceptual approval for demolition of the structure a second time on January 21, 2015, noting an economic hardship.

g. Finding h is in reference to the claim for economic hardship that was previously approved by the HDRC in accordance with the conceptual approval of the proposed hotel tower on January 21, 2015.

h. The loss of a historic landmark constitutes an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. Demolition of any contributing buildings should only occur after every attempt has been made, within reason, to successfully reuse the structure. Clear and convincing evidence supporting an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant if the application for a certificate is disapproved must be presented by the applicant in order for demolition to be considered. The criteria for establishing unreasonable economic hardship are listed in UDC Section 35-614 (b)(3). The applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that:

A. The owner cannot make reasonable beneficial use of or realize a reasonable rate of return on a structure or site, regardless of whether that return represents the most profitable return possible, unless the highly significant endangered, historic and cultural landmark, historic and cultural landmarks district or demolition delay designation, as applicable, is removed or the proposed demolition or relocation is allowed;

[The applicant claims that without the demolition of 161 E Commerce, the owner would not be able to develop an economically viable project at this location without adding additional density to the site. The property was originally purchased in 2013 for \$2,150,000. In total, the applicant has indicated that the current owner has invested over 1 million dollars throughout the period of ownership on improvements, taxes and architectural work attempting to re-use both buildings. During this time of ownership, the applicant has claimed a net loss of \$176,414.55. A 2013 estimate of the fair market value of the structure and property as determined by a qualified appraiser was \$2,100,000.]

B. The structure and property cannot be reasonably adapted for any other feasible use, whether by the current owner or by a purchaser, which would result in a reasonable rate of return;

[The applicant claims that, due to issues related to the integrity of the structure of the existing building as well as existing constraints such as the structure's footprint, it is not feasibly possible to re-use both buildings, meet current fire and safety codes and retain enough sufficient space to lease the building. A construction estimate provided in the summer of 2013 estimated the cost of the rehabilitation of the existing building to include 4 apartments and a shell (unfinished) restaurant space was \$4,290,942. The applicant has also noted that the property in question has been vacant for the past 30 + years.]

C. The owner has failed to find a purchaser or tenant for the property during the previous two (2) years, despite having made substantial ongoing efforts during that period to do so. The evidence of unreasonable economic hardship introduced by the owner may, where applicable, include proof that the owner's affirmative

obligations to maintain the structure or property make it impossible for the owner to realize a reasonable rate of return on the structure or property.

[While the applicant has not actively marketed the site to potential purchasers, a history of projects have been proposed at this site by multiple owners that have been not been successful due to a lack of feasibility or economic hardships. The applicant as indicated that under the current proposal for demolition of the Sullivan building, additional density could be added while preserving to Fishmarket leading to the successful redevelopment of the corner of E Commerce and N St. Mary's.]

i. Staff finds that the applicant has made a legitimate claim for an economic hardship based on Criterion A, B and C.

j. If the HDRC finds that the claim for an economic hardship has been thoroughly substantiated in the application and that the conditions of UDC 35-614 which would warrant demolition apply, a recommendation for approval of the request for demolition will not authorize the issuance of a demolition permit. A permit will not be issued until replacement plans for the new construction are approved and all applicable fees are collected. The UDC states that permits for demolition and new construction shall be issued simultaneously if the requirements for new construction are met, and the property owner provides financial proof of his ability to complete the project.

Findings related to request item #2:

k. Previously, conceptual approval was given to a similar proposal of a hotel tower at this site on May 5, 2010. Since that time, both the design and owners of the property have changed. On October 2, 2013, conceptual approval was given to another proposal to restore the facades of both 155 and 161, remove the rear façade of the Sullivan Building to create an open courtyard, install storefront windows and balconies and to construct a single story addition to the building at 161 E Commerce.

l. A previous request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on November 24, 2014. At that meeting, concern was expressed over solar access to the river, the proposed materials, the demolition process and the visual weight of the concrete wall that's proposed for the E Commerce façade. Since then, the applicant has provided additional information in regards to each of these concerns. That request was reviewed again by the Design Review Committee on January 13, 2015. At that meeting concern was expressed over the façade arrangement in regards to the UDC Section 35-674(d)(1), how much of the original flood wall would be retained and if there would be any re-use of stone at the river level.

m. The request for demolition was also reviewed by the Designation and Demolition Committee on January 14, 2014. At that meeting, the previous approval of the demolition of the Sullivan Building was discussed as well as the changes to the new construction and how they were different than the previous two approvals. The preservation of the Fishmarket as well as the preservation of the Rio Rita Cistern were two of the main concerns during this site visit.

n. The request for final approval was reviewed again by the Design Review Committee on January 15, 2016. At that meeting concern was expressed over exterior materials, the purpose of the third floor balcony cantilever, the protection and retention of existing Hugman Riverwalk features, where the curb-side drop off is located, the location of the VIA bus stop, the creation of cross traffic and landscaping options. It was stated that cedar elm would be appropriate. The applicant stated that landscaping plans would be submitted at a later date. All concerns were addressed at the meeting and the Committee recommendation was to approve. The applicant submitted hand drawings and a photo of samples of the façade materials to staff following the DRC meeting.

o. The street and river level façade arrangement is detailed in hand drawings and has been submitted by the applicant. The applicant is proposing façade to include larger limestone blocks with intervals of various colored bricks. Staff finds this proposal as well as façade arrangement to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.

p. The applicant has proposed a restaurant and outdoor seating area at the Riverwalk level at the rear of the proposed hotel tower. The proposal is consistent with the UDC Section 35-672(a)(2) in regards to pedestrian circulation and linking the various functions and spaces on a site with sidewalks in a coordinated system. UDC Section 25-672(a)(5) addresses pedestrian access along the Riverwalk pathway and how it shall not be blocked by queuing, hostess stations and tables and chairs. The applicant has noted that pedestrian access at the Riverwalk level will not be obstructed.

q. Given its unique placement at the corner of E Commerce and N St. Mary's as well as its placement on the San Antonio River, this proposal will be the focal point of many views. According to the UDC Section 35-672(c)(1), properties that appear to be the terminus at the end of the street or at a prominent curve in the river shall incorporate into their design an architectural feature that will provide a focal point at the end of the view. The proposed hotel is consistent with the section in many regards including additional height, variation in roof shape, change of color or material and the addition of other design enhancement features.

r. The UDC Section 35-673(a)(1) provides guidelines for solar access to the San Antonio River in regards to new construction. The applicant has provided a solar study of both the summer and winter solstices indicating the impact that the proposed tower will have on solar access to the river. As shown in the solar study, the applicant's request is consistent with the UDC.

s. According to the UDC Section 35-673, buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. Primary entrances should be oriented toward the street and shall be distinguishable by an architectural feature. The applicant has proposed a material change at the ground floor where the primary entrances are located. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-673.

t. The applicant has proposed to retain the existing trees in the public right of way along N St Mary's and to plant a new tree at the river level as well as install planters at the property line along the Riverwalk. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-673(f) in regards to plant materials.

u. The applicant has proposed to create a dining and outdoor patio area at the Riverwalk level where materials are to include concrete, limestone and various patio furniture. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the UDC Section 35-673(g) and (1).

v. Lighting design for any project located in a RIO district is an important aspect of not only that particular project's design, but also the adjacent buildings as well as the Riverwalk. The applicant has provided information located in the construction document set that addresses exterior lighting and information regarding fixture materials and locations. This is consistent with the UDC.

w. The UDC Section 35-673(l)(3)(A) addresses access to the public pathway along the river. The applicant has proposed to include dining areas at the Riverwalk level, therefore a clearly defined from the site onto the public right of way must be included into the design with either an architectural or landscape element. The applicant has complied with this section by including both architectural elements and landscaping elements in the form of planters.

x. The UDC Section 35-673(n) addresses service areas and mechanical equipment and their impact on the public. Service areas and mechanical equipment should be visually unobtrusive and should be integrated with the design of the site and building. Noise generated from mechanical equipment shall not exceed city noise regulations. The applicant is proposing to place the mechanical service equipment on the roof on an elevated podium situated on the eastern half of the roof deck. The equipment will be screened with metal panels which is consistent with the UDC.

y. According to the UDC Section 35-674(b) a building shall appear to have a "human scale". To comply with this, an building must (1) express façade components in ways that will help to establish building scale, (2) align horizontal building elements with others in the blockface to establish building scale, (3) express the distinction between upper and lower levels, (4) in this instance, divide the façade of the building into modules that express traditional and (5) organize the mass of a building to provide solar access to the river. The applicant has provided evidence that they have met each of these requirements.

z. According to the UDC Section 35-674(c) in regards to the height of new construction in RIO districts, there are no height restrictions for new construction in RIO 3 other than the solar access standards in which this proposal complies. Section 35-674(c)(3) states that building facades shall appear similar in height to those of other buildings found traditionally in the area. This section also states that if fifty (50) percent of the building facades within a block face are predominantly lower than the maximum height allowed, the new building façade on the street-side shall align with the average height of those lower buildings within the block face, or with a particular building that falls within the fifty (50) percent range. While the current proposal is taller than more than fifty (50) percent of the other facades along the block face, staff finds that there are other buildings of similar height in the area, notably the Drury Plaza Hotel located on the south side of E Commerce, and that the proposed height of approximately two hundred fifty (250) feet is appropriate at this location.

aa. In regards to materials and finishes, the UDC Section 35-674(d)(1) states that indigenous materials and traditional building materials should be used for primary wall surfaces. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of walls (excluding window fenestrations) shall be composed of the following: Modular masonry materials including brick, stone, and rusticated masonry block, tile, terra-cotta, structural clay tile and cast stone. Concrete masonry units (CMU) are not allowed. However according to 35-674(2)(B), glass curtain wall panels are allowed in RIO-3 as long as the river and street levels comply with 35-674(d)(1). The applicant is proposing materials including masonry, limestone, glass curtain walls, glass panels and other cementitious materials consistent with those found throughout RIO-3. Staff finds that this is consistent with 35-67(d)1).

bb. According to the UDC Section 35-674 in regards to façade composition, high rise buildings, more than one hundred (100) feet in height shall terminate with a distinctive top or cap. In addition to this, curtain wall systems

shall be designed with modulating features such as projecting horizontal and/or vertical mullions, entrances shall be easy to find, be a special feature of the building and be appropriately scaled and the riverside façade of a building shall have simpler detailing and composition than the street façades. The applicant has proposed a rooftop pool and penthouse mechanical space to serve as the terminus or architectural cap for the tower. This is consistent with the UDC.

cc. The applicant is proposing an entrance canopy on the N St. Mary's façade spanning the approximate width of the S Mary's entrance. The proposal is consistent with the UDC Section 35-674(g) in regards to form and color.

dd. **ARCHAEOLOGY**-The property is located within the River Improvement Overlay District, the Spanish Colonial Potrero, and is adjacent to the San Antonio River. Moreover, it is in close proximity to the Main and Military Plazas National Register of Historic Places District. Furthermore, previously recorded archaeological site 41BX483 is located within the project boundary. Therefore, archaeological investigations are required

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval as submitted with the stipulations that:

- i. The applicant create and supply staff with Dutchmen samples prior to their production and installation on the Dwyer Building façade to ensure appropriate materials, textures and detailing.
- ii. Archaeology – An archaeological investigation is required.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve as submitted.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Salas, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

5. HDRC NO. 2015-149

Applicant: Scott Carpenter/Seventh Generation Design

Address: 600 Block of Burleson at Olive

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to add Prototype 5 to a new development that was originally approved at the HDRC hearing on December 15, 2015.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is requesting to add a fifth townhome prototype to the stock of homes previously approved by HDRC on July 15, 2015. A total of three prototype 5 homes would be incorporated into the approved site plan, and would be oriented along an existing alley perpendicular to Olive Street.

b. Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, front facades of new buildings should align with adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established. Although there are no buildings facing Burleson on this block, buildings on the next blocks east and west are set back from the street approximately 15-20 ft. The proposed townhomes follow the setback pattern on adjacent blocks and are consistent with the guidelines.

c. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front façade of new buildings should be consistent with the predominant orientation of historic buildings along the street frontage. Within the Dignowity Hill historic district, a clear pattern of building orientation exists. Houses along Olive Street including corner properties face Olive and houses located mid-block face the side street. As presented, units along Olive will face internal streets which will break the continuity of the street and is not consistent with the guidelines. However, the addition of small stoop porches and secondary entrances on Olive makes this elevation more inviting and appropriate for its setting.

d. The Guidelines for New Construction recommend new buildings have roof forms including pitch, overhangs, and orientation that are consistent to those predominantly found on the block. The proposed front gabled roof form is consistent with the Guidelines.

e. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, materials that complement the type, color and texture of materials traditionally found in the district should be used. The majority of houses within the Dignowity Hill Historic District are clad in wood siding. The proposed cement board plank and panel siding may be appropriate if proper dimension,

finish and texture is used, however wood siding would be more appropriate. In addition, different colors for each unit should be incorporated in order to provide variety and enhance each unit's character.

f. Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, roof materials that are similar in terms of form, color, and texture to those traditionally used in the district should be used. The proposed composition shingle roof is consistent with the guidelines in material and form.

g. Window and door openings with a similar proportion of wall to window space as nearby historic facades should be incorporated. Windows and doors should be considered similar if they are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height to width ratio from adjacent historic facades as recommended by the Guidelines for New Construction. The proposed window sizes and pattern is consistent with the guidelines. However, large expanses of blank walls are not typical of historic facades and should be avoided.

h. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, new garages should match the predominant orientation found along the block. The prototype features an attached garage with an overhead door that is oriented to the rear of the structure. Although the garage is attached to the primary structure, staff finds that its orientation toward the alley is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

i. The proposed prototype features a small second floor balcony that extends over the front entrance and beyond the roof overhang. It is screened with horizontal wood slat railing. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 4A.ii, incorporate architectural details that are in keeping with the predominant architectural style along the block face or within the district when one exists. Details should be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the character of the adjacent historic structures or other historic structures within the district. None of the other prototypes feature a balcony, however staff finds that this detail is appropriate as it does not impact the streetscape of Burleson and Olive.

j. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, mechanical equipment should not be located on primary facades or on locations where visible from the street. The proposed optional cistern in the front yard of the prototype is consistent with the Guidelines in this case because the front elevation faces into the complex and does not face Burleson and Olive directly.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through j.

Withdrawn at the request of the applicant: Applicant will return with further details regarding façade arrangement and how the proposed overhang will be framed & detailed.

THE MOTION CARRIED

6. HDRC NO. 2015-263

Applicant: Dyal and Partners

Address: 434 S Alamo St.

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a wayfinding and donor recognition signage system for the Hemisfair Historic District Redevelopment as well as seek final approval of the master signage plan. The first implementation of the master signage plan system will be as a part of the Yanaguana Garden project and will then become the district standard for wayfinding and donor recognition and will be used in all future phases of the Hemisfair Redevelopment.

FINDINGS:

a. The request for conceptual approval was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on May 26, 2015, where committee members questioned the location of cabinet signs, noted the overall high quality of the design and had concerns regarding the longevity of the wood proposed in the kit of parts. At the July 1, 2015, Historic and Design Review Commission meeting, commissioners noted that the proposed overall height was appropriate and approved the request for conceptual approval.

b. According to the Guidelines for Signage 4.A.i. and ii., the proper usage and placement of freestanding signs are in areas that are set back from the street, in commercial districts and in areas that are pedestrian oriented that do not block the public right of way. The applicant's proposed locations are consistent with the Guidelines.

c. The applicant has proposed a number of signs that range from 1' – 5" to 12' – 2" in height. Per the UDC Section 35-678 regarding Signs and Billboards in the RIO, freestanding signs are allowed provided the sign does not interfere with pedestrian or vehicular traffic, shall be perpendicular to the street, two-sided and no taller than six feet in height. While the UDC includes this provision, staff finds that the applicant's proposed overall height of signage is an integral part in the hierarchy of the proposed design and kit of parts. Staff finds this proposal appropriate.

d. According to both the UDC Section 35-678(e)(4) and the Guidelines for Signage, total requested signage should not exceed more than fifty total square feet, however additional square footage may be approved given that signage does not interfere with the pedestrian experience. Given the size of the Hemisfair District, staff finds that the proposed additional square footage is appropriate.

e. The applicant has proposed materials of board form concrete, quarry stone, yellow pine, perforated metal, blackened steel, steel wide flange columns with wood infill and a variety of colors which include rhodamine, orange, designer white, light green and light blue. Staff finds each of these colors appropriate for Hemisfair park and each of the proposed materials consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 1.D.ii.

f. The applicant has noted that Sign Types B11, C11, D11, E3, E8 AND I13 are to be internally illuminated with light extruding through perforated metal panels. Staff finds this method of illumination to be gentle and appropriate.

g. As the applicant has submitted a kit of parts that staff finds is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Signage and the UDC, additional signage locations within Hemisfair Park that are consistent with the master signage plan will be eligible for administrative approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a through g.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Salas, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

10. HDRC NO. 2015-320

Applicant: White Conlee Builders, Ltd

Address: 1515 MISSION RD

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct five apartment structures comprised of both three and four story structures, a clubhouse, a commercial pet daycare and miscellaneous accessory structures known as the Mission Escondida Luxury Apartments (MELA).

FINDINGS:

General Findings:

a. This address falls within the buffer zone of the World Heritage sites. The applicant is responsible for complying with all regulations and meeting any design standards associated with the inscription.

b. This current request for new construction is only applicable to the specific project area noted as Phase 1, the northern portion of the site not immediately adjacent to the San Antonio River. Any approval associated with Phase 1 does not provide authority over future site or building design associated Phase 2.

c. The request for both conceptual approval of site design, building placement and façade arrangement was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on July 15, 2015, where committee members noted that overall the proposed development would be welcomed to the area. On August 19, 2015, the request for conceptual approval was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission where citizens voiced their concern and commissioners noted inconsistencies with the Unified Development Code as well as the Historic Design Guidelines. At that hearing, this request was referred to the Design Review Committee.

d. This request was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on August 25, 2015. At that time the applicant's request included only conceptual approval of site design and building placement. Committee members noted that the updated site plan provided information regarding a San Antonio Water Service easement, suggested that the applicant maximize golf course views, noted that the development presented a non-urban design, that the design should include urban gestures, that a figure ground diagram should be developed and that the previously presented façade arrangement was not appropriate given the proximity of this property to the San Antonio River, San Antonio Missions National Park and its location within the Mission Historic District.

e. The request for conceptual approval of site design and building placement reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 16, 2015, where committee members noted that the applicant had addressed staff's stipulations and concerns, that a reasonable representation of site constraints had been shown and that the applicant should meet with the Roosevelt Park Neighborhood Association.

f. The applicant received conceptual approval of site and building layout for the proposed MELA development at 1515 Mission on October 7, 2015. This conceptual approval was the review of general design ideas and principles of the site design and building placement as it relates to Phase I. Neither the previously conceptually approved site design nor current request for façade arrangement apply to Phase II.

g. This request for conceptual approval of the façade arrangement was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on October 27, 2015. At that meeting, committee members noted that the site and environment were not urban and that modifications to building placement will not present the site in an urban setting, that the lowering of the roofs of the outside towers would be appropriate, that the clubhouse elevations were "over done", that there is no need to incorporate classical details, particularly arches and that the proposed large windows are appropriate.

h. The request for conceptual approval of the façade arrangement was set to be heard at the November 18, 2015, Historic and Design Review Commission meeting, however, the HDRC was unable to hold a quorum to hear this specific request. On December 10, 2015, the Historic Preservation Officer issued an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed façade arrangement. The request for final approval was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on January 25, 2016, where committee members noted that the simplified window design was appropriate, asked questions regarding materials and of the applicant's coordination with the Roosevelt Park Neighborhood Association.

Findings related to the proposed new construction:

i. Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has provided a site plan that has noted sidewalk connections across the property and has connected the various functions of the site in a coordinated system incorporated an interior courtyard and an exterior, perimeter path. This is consistent with the UDC.

j. Paving materials used for pedestrian walkways are to be visually and texturally different than those used for automobile traffic and parking. Per application documents, the applicant has noted the installation of a new public access trail along Mission Road, the San Antonio River and various private pedestrian walkways that are to include concrete paving and stone paving. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-672(a)(3).

k. The applicant has noted two curb cuts in the provided site plan; both for automobile traffic to access surface parking lots. Per the UDC Section 35-672(b)(1)(B), curb cuts may be no larger than twenty-five (25) feet. The applicant's two proposed curb cuts are consistent with the UDC.

l. Regarding onsite parking, surface parking areas are to be located toward the interior of the site or to the side or rear of a building and shall be screened or buffered from view of public streets and the San Antonio River if they are located within a fifty-foot setback from the edge of the river ROW use and within a twenty-foot setback from a property line adjacent to a street use. The applicant has proposed surface parking adjacent to a street use. The applicant has noted the installation of shrubbery to buffer any proposed parking from the public right of way. This is consistent with the UDC.

m. Per the UDC Section 35-673(b), buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. For projects with two or more buildings on a site, buildings should be clustered to create active open space such as courtyards along the street and river edges. The applicant has arranged four interior buildings to create an interior courtyard featuring a swimming pool and has provided information regarding site constraints which prevent the creation of additional active spaces regarding the northern edge of the site. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to incorporate public pathways to run adjacent to Mission Road to interconnect with the Mission Reach of the San Antonio Riverwalk as well as construct a clubhouse that can be reserved for use by the neighborhood. Staff finds this appropriate and a measure necessary in complying with the UDC regarding the creation of active spaces.

n. The UDC Section 35-673(b)(1)(A) both state that a building's orientation as well as primary entrance should be toward the street. In addition to this, the Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 4, Guidelines for New Construction 1.A. and B. state that a building's orientation as well as primary entrance should be oriented to be consistent with the building orientation found throughout the district; toward the street. Immediately adjacent to the property under review is the Blessed Sacrament Academy, which features a campus layout. The applicant has proposed a similar campus layout, however, has proposed both pedestrian access points as well as the main entrances of buildings to be oriented toward avenues of high pedestrian traffic. Staff finds this appropriate.

o. The UDC Section 35-673(c) provides guidelines regarding the preservation of the existing natural contours and distinct character of the San Antonio River. The applicant is responsible for coordinating with the San Antonio River Authority regarding storm water control measures, access to parks, landscaping and maintenance boundaries. The applicant has met these requirements.

p. According to the UDC Section 35-673(e)(1), no more than seventy-five percent of the landscape materials, including plants, shall be the same as those on adjacent properties and (e)(2)(A) which states that planting requirements in RIO-4, RIO-5, and RIO-6 should continue the restoration landscape efforts along the river banks. For RIO-4, sixty percent of the river bank is to be landscaped. At this time, the applicant has not proposed to develop the Lot 60, the parcel immediately adjacent to the San Antonio River. Staff finds that the proposed maintaining of the existing conditions is appropriate given the applicant's responsible treatment of the proposed pedestrian connection at the existing Mission Reach. The applicant should provide this information to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

q. The applicant has noted per the site plan that the proposed development is to include various paved walkways and a paved, interior courtyard. Per the UDC Section 35-673(g), in RIO-4, a maximum of six hundred square feet is allowed for a single paving material before the paving material must be divided or separated with a paving materials that is different in texture, pattern, color or material and that a maximum of one hundred linear feet is allowed in a walkway before the pattern must change in materials. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the UDC.

r. The applicant has proposed a perimeter fence of stone and wrought iron. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-673(h).

s. The applicant has proposed street furnishings along the perimeter of the property along the San Antonio River. Per the UDC, street furnishings shall be made of wood, metal, stone, terra cotta, cast stone, hand sculpted concrete or solid surfacing materials. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the UDC.

t. The applicant has provided information regarding site lighting along pedestrian pathways, at intersections and important crossings. This is consistent with the UDC.

u. Per the UDC Section 35-673(m) and (n), Buffering and Screening should be used to screen various mechanical and service equipment from the public right of way. The applicant has provided site plans noting various forms of screening including landscaping and architectural elements. This is consistent with the UDC.

v. Bicycle parking helps promote a long term sustainable strategy for development in RIO Districts. The applicant is responsible for providing bicycle parking in well let and accessible areas on the site per UDC Section 35-673(o) and 35-526.

w. According to the UDC Section 35-674(b), a building shall appear to have a "human scale", which can be achieved by the expression of façade components, the aligning of horizontal building elements with others in the block face, the distinction between upper and lower floors and the division of the façade into modules that express traditional dimensions. The applicant has proposed multiple components that achieve this which include stone cladding, multiple projecting balconies, appropriately sized window openings and balcony railings and human scaled façade panels. This is consistent with the UDC.

x. The materials that have been proposed by the applicant include a natural stone veneer, stucco, aluminum windows, cement plaster, cedar, decorative iron work and barrel tile roofing. These materials are consistent with the UDC Section 35-674(d).

y. According to the UDC Section 35-674(e), building facades located in the River Improvement Overlay must be organized into three distinct segments; a base, mid-section and cap. Through a change in façade materials, the use of moldings at the roofline, the use a parapet wall and the application of the barrel tile roofing the applicant has clearly

z. In addition to the applicant's vertical façade separation, the applicant has proposed a number of architectural elements that have separated the façade into various segments as it is read horizontally. These instances include changes in materials, the inclusion of projecting balconies and horizontally oriented moldings; staff finds this appropriate.

aa. In regards to window fenestration, the UDC Section 35-674 (2) states that windows help provide a human scale to a façade and therefore should be recessed at least two (2) inches within solid walls, they should relate in design and scale to the spaces behind them, they shall be used in hierarchy to articulate important places on the façade and

grouped to establish rhythms and that curtain wall systems should be designed with modulating features such as projecting horizontal and/or vertical mullions. Generally the applicant's proposal is consistent with the UDC. The applicant is responsible for recessing each window at least two (2) inches within each wall to create additional façade depth.

bb. The UDC Section 35-674(3) states that entrances shall be easy to find, be a special feature of the building and be appropriately scaled. Staff finds that the applicant's proposed entrances are consistent with the UDC.

cc. While the primary use of this development will be residential, there is a commercial component as well as a club house that will also serve as a community center. The club house, noted as the Mission Road Club in the provided architectural documents will feature materials consistent with those found on the residential structures; stucco, stone and barrel tile roofing and will be distinguishable from the residential structures through mass, square footage and façade arrangement. At the corner of the south and east elevations, the applicant has proposed an architectural focal point featuring a tower and large arched entrance. Staff finds the tower proposal and arched opening appropriate.

dd. As shown in the application documents, the applicant has proposed the use of canopies and awnings in various locations throughout the project. The UDC Section 34-675 (g) (1),(2) and (3) give the design standards for awnings, canopies and arcades in the River Improvement Overlay. Staff finds the applicant's proposal appropriate.

ee. Ground disturbing activities exceeding 2 to 3 feet in depth in portions of the property, including those for new construction, will require monitoring by a qualified archaeologist.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends final approval based on findings a through dd with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide a site plan noting the following: landscaping at the San Antonio River through coordination with SARA, specifics regarding a connection to the Mission Reach of the Riverwalk and specified locations for bicycle parking.
- ii. That the applicant provide a roof plan noting the screening of any building mounted mechanical equipment.
- iii. Archaeological monitoring is required. The archaeology consultant will coordinate with the OHP to determine which areas require monitoring.

Citizens to be heard: Martha Henry submitted a letter of opposition for this case

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Salas, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

12. HDRC NO. 2016-023

Applicant: Rodney Anderson

Address: 725 E Magnolia Ave

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Enlarge existing window openings on the south façade.
2. Install vinyl windows throughout the original structures.
3. Construct a rear addition.
4. Install window trim around each vinyl window on the original structure as well as the addition.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 725 E Magnolia was constructed circa 1935 and is of the Craftsman style. Over the course of its existence, this structure has undergone various modifications that are neither architecturally nor historically appropriate.

b. A stop work order was issued on December 4, 2015, for the construction of a rear addition and exterior modifications without a Certificate of Appropriateness. An additional stop work order was issued on December 18, 2015, for exterior modifications and the construction of a privacy fence that were not approved. At this time, all required post

work application fees have been paid.

c. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on January 28, 2016, where committee members questioned the locations and conditions of the existing additions, questioned existing windows, expressed concerns regarding the new addition, primarily the addition of its third gable and overall height, expressed concerns over façade and trim materials, noted that wood pillars would be more appropriate than brick and noted that the proposed windows in the front façade as well as the left elevation were appropriate.

d. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., existing window openings and original windows themselves should be preserved. Many of the original window openings have been modified over time, including the street facing window double width fixed window which the applicant has proposed to remove and replace with two vinyl windows. Beneath the porch, the applicant has proposed to modify the existing front facing window opening to be identical to the proposed windows on the front most façade. The applicant's proposed fenestration pattern as well as window materials are inconsistent. Staff finds that the installation of wood windows would be consistent with the Guidelines.

e. Similar to the front facing façade, the applicant has proposed to install double width vinyl windows on both the east and west facades. This fenestration pattern as well as window material is not consistent with the Guidelines which specifically state that new windows should match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. The existing windows were primarily aluminum.

f. At the rear of the historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an addition featuring wood siding, vinyl windows and an asphalt shingle roof. While the applicant's proposed addition is properly sited, its massing and height are not consistent with the Guidelines as the height is taller than that of the original structure. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.

g. Around new vinyl windows in the addition, the applicant has proposed to install window trim to add depth to the framing of the windows. Staff finds the installation of this window trim appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 through #3 based on findings d through f. Staff recommends that the applicant maintain the size of all existing window openings, install windows that are of appropriate materials and construct an addition that is consistent with the Guidelines in regards to massing and height. Staff recommends approval of item #4 based on finding g.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve with staff stipulation & return to HDRC with final drawings.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Salas, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

13. HDRC NO. 2016-059

Applicant: Ruben Carrillo

Address: 938 Dawson St

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct an 800 square foot addition to the rear of the house.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to add an 800 square foot addition to the rear of the primary structure located at 938 Dawson. The addition will feature a finish that is similar to the existing materials on the primary structure.

b. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.

c. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that residential additions should be sited at the side or rear of the primary historic structure whenever possible, that views of the addition should be limited from the public right of way and that additions should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block all while featuring a transition between the original structure and the addition. The applicant has proposed to site the proposed addition to the side and rear of the original structure, has limited the amount of the addition that will be viewable from the public right of way and has designed the addition that is appropriate in regards to historic context all while featuring aspects that distinguish it from the original structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

d. In regards to scale, massing and form, residential additions should be designed to be subordinate to the principal façade of the original structure, should feature a footprint that responds to the size of the lot and should feature a height that is consistent with the original structure. The applicant has designed the addition in a more modest form regarding detailing and has designed it at 800 square feet. The existing square footage of the living area is approximately 738 square feet. Although the addition would double the square footage of the living area of the primary structure, the lot is approximately 7,160 square feet. This is appropriate with the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.

e. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.v., the height of new additions should be consistent with the height of the existing structure; an addition's height should never be so contrasting as to overwhelm or distract from the existing structure. The applicant has proposed an overall height that not only is greater than that of the original structure's, but in general is not subordinate to the original structure as it should be. Additionally, the applicant has proposed a complex roof form that is not complimentary of the original structure's architecture. This is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant reduce the height of the addition to become consistent with the Guidelines for Additions as well as proposed a roof with traditional forms and proportions.

f. The applicant has proposed an addition that is in keeping with the historic context of the block as well as an addition that incorporates appropriately scaled architectural details. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff finds the applicant's proposed orientation, massing and materials to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends that the following stipulations be met prior to the applicant returning to HDRC:

- i. That the applicant utilizes a setback or recessed area and a small change in detailing at the seam of the historic structure and new addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms.
- ii. The roof plan is simplified and reduced in height.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Salas, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

14. HDRC NO. 2016-063

Applicant: Logan Fullmer & George Herrera

Address: 532 DAWSON ST & 417 N MESQUITE ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct two, multi-family residential units at the corner of Dawson and N Mesquite.

FINDINGS:

a. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.

b. A previous request by the same applicant was conceptually approved on September 2, 2015. At this time, the applicant has proposed a new design that does not reflect the previous request.

c. The current request, the construction of two, detached multi-family units was first reviewed by the Design Review Committee on December 8, 2015, where committee members had questions regarding parking and the preservation of existing trees and noted that generally the proposed scale and massing were appropriate.

d. The applicant has aligned the corner unit to be setback approximately twenty feet from the public right of way on

Dawson Street and approximately ten feet from the public right of way on N Mesquite, aligning both structures with the existing structures fronting both streets. Additionally, the applicant has proposed for the corner unit to feature a porch that fronts both Dawson and N Mesquite. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i and ii.

e. The applicant has proposed for both structures to be two stories in height. While there are examples of two story residential structures present in the Dignowity Hill Historic District, the majority of residential structures in the immediate vicinity feature one story. When the height of new construction exceeds that of the surrounding historic structures, a step-down in building height should be used to provide a visual transition between the taller, new construction and the surrounding historic structures. The applicant has incorporated various architectural elements to facilitate a visual transition including single height porches on both the first and second levels, sloping roofs above first level porches and vertically oriented siding, each of which present a visual transition. Staff finds this approach appropriate.

f. The applicant has proposed for both structures to feature sloping front porch roofs and front and side gable roofs. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.

g. The Guidelines for New Construction 2.D. in regards to lot coverage states that new construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio and that the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the total lot area unless adjacent historic buildings establish a precedent with a greater building to lot ratio. The applicant has noted that the overall combined lot area 8,045 square feet. The total proposed square footage of the new construction of both structures is 2,785 square feet. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

h. The applicant has proposed materials that include cement fiber board siding and trim, standing seam metal roofs, Pella Impervia fiberglass windows, exterior windows screens and cedar fencing. Generally, these materials are consistent with the Guidelines, however, staff finds that the installation of wood windows would be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant's proposal to install fiberglass windows is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant refer to the Historic Design Guidelines, Guidelines for Windows document for an appropriate approach to window fenestration and installation.

i. The applicant has proposed a number of contemporary interpretations of historic design features including first and second level porches and balconies, side carports which feature architectural elements consistent with front porch overhangs and windows which feature a traditional ratio and placement. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.

j. While the proposed new construction features multiple units, both structures present only one door facing the public right of way, an element that staff finds brings a sense of a single family structure to a multi-family project.

k. The applicant has not specified a specific location for mechanical equipment at this time. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A. and B. in regards to the placements and screening of mechanical equipment.

l. At various locations the applicant has proposed rear wood privacy fences to be approximately six feet in height to separate the proposed units from themselves and adjacent lots. The applicant will be responsible for complying with the Guidelines for Site Elements 2. B. and C. in regards to the final design and materials of fences and walls.

m. The applicant has proposed ribbon driveways to be ten feet in width and sidewalks consistent with the historic example found in Dignowity Hill. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements. Staff recommends the applicant produce documents and a landscaping plan noting all proposed landscaping materials. In addition to the Guidelines for Site Elements, staff recommends that the applicant refer to the UDC Appendix E: San Antonio Recommended Plant List – All Suited to Xeriscape Planting Methods, for a list of appropriate materials and planting methods.

n. The applicant has provided a tree survey locating all existing trees on the property. This is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements 3.D. as well as the UDC Section 35-525 in regards to tree preservation.

o. The applicant has proposed a standing seam metal roof color of black which is not typical in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds that an appropriate roof color would be a galvalume finish, consistent with those found throughout the district.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed setbacks, building placement, roof form, porch designs and façade arrangement. Additionally, staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed cement fiber board siding and trim and roofing material. Staff recommends the applicant address the following items prior to returning to the HDRC

- i. That the applicant provide staff with a detailed landscaping plan noting all landscaping materials.
- ii. That the applicant provide staff with a site plan noting the location and appropriate screening of all mechanical

equipment.

iii. That the applicant provide additional information to staff on the proposed window materials and a framing detail noting that each window is inset at least two to three inches from the exterior of the wall.

Citizens to be heard: Liz Franklin, DHNA & Seema Karim, DHNA spoke in support of this case.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve as submitted.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Salas, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

15. HDRC NO. 2016-064

Applicant: Beverly Schantz/LK Design Group

Address: 423 S Alamo St

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove two wood windows, one on the north, and one on the south façade, and to install doors in their place at the German-English Schoolhouse at 423 S Alamo.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is proposing to remove two existing historic wood window, each of a four over four configuration. The openings will be modified to accommodate the installation of a 2 panel solid wood door with 1/4" tempered glass lite, painted white to match existing standard doors on the north façade of the German-English School house.

b. This German-English School building is a two-story, limestone, German-vernacular structure built in 1869. The German-English School is a Registered Texas Historic Landmark.

c. According to the Guidelines for Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., existing window and door openings should be preserved and altering opening size should be avoided. On the north façade the window pattern is symmetrical with each existing door flanked by either a window or a double door. Installing the single door create an irregular window pattern. Staff finds the opening alteration on the north façade not consistent with the guidelines.

d. The south façade is the rear façade subdivided by the mechanical equipment room. The east portion of the south façade is to be altered. On the southwest facade there are 3 evenly spaced existing window openings and no doors. The window on the right is isolated by a wood privacy fence that extends from the rear façade, between the middle and right door, to the south property line. The proposed door installation would break up the window pattern. Staff finds the opening alteration on the south façade not consistent with the guidelines.

e. According to the Guidelines for Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii., historic windows should be preserved.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through e.

If the commission approves the removal of the two windows, staff recommends stipulations that the applicant salvages the historic wood windows and limestone material for potential use in the future.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to deny the applicants request.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Salas, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

16. HDRC NO. 2016-055

Applicant: Stevie Bear/Community REI LLC

Address: 220 Hermine Blvd

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to postpone their decision due to applicant's absence.

THE MOTION CARRIED

30. HDRC NO. 2016-065

Applicant: Kimberlee Lorenz/ReVamp Design Build

Address: 133 Devine St

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a two story rear addition to the structure at 133 Devine. The applicant has proposed materials to include wood windows, wood siding and a standing seam metal roof.

FINDINGS:

a. The house at 133 Devine is of the Folk Victorian style and was constructed circa 1915 and is a contributing structure in the Lavaca Historic District.

b. At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a new, two story addition. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i., residential additions should be located at the rear of the primary historic structure to minimize view from the public right of way. The applicant has located the proposed addition at the rear of the existing structure, however, staff is concerned with the overall height of the proposed structure. Staff recommends that the applicant provide a line of sight study to ensure that the proposed addition will not impact the street facing façade of the primary historic structure.

c. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.ii., new residential additions should be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block. This block of Devine primarily features single story historic structures; however, there are historic structures in the immediate vicinity that feature both multiple stories as well as tall single height floors. Staff finds that an addition with two floors may be appropriate in this location, however, the applicant should provide additional information to ensure that the proposed structure's massing is appropriate and subordinate than that of the original structure's.

d. The applicant has proposed for the addition to include a series of hipped roofs. Staff finds that a lower pitched roof consisting of gables will not only reduce the overall height of the addition, but also further relate it to the original structure's. Overall height of the of the proposed addition's ridgeline is greater than that of the original structures. Staff finds that a ridgeline that is subordinate to that of the original structure's is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.i.

e. Regarding a transition from the original structure to the addition, the applicant has proposed various vertical trim pieces as well as façade elements that will facilitate in a transition and distinguish the addition from the original structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv.

f. Generally, the height of new additions should be consistent with the height of the existing structure. As noted in finding d, the overall height of the proposed addition is inappropriate. Staff recommends the applicant modify the proposed roof form and reduce the overall height to be consistent with the Guidelines.

g. The applicant has proposed materials that include reclaimed double hung wood windows, repurposed French doors, wood siding and trim and a standing seam metal roof. Staff finds these materials appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.

h. Regarding window fenestration, staff finds that generally the applicant has proposed window openings that are appropriately sized and placed, however, staff finds that the applicant should provide a window section and framing information to ensure that all windows are framed to include an appropriate depth.

RECOMMENDATION:

At this time, staff does not recommend final approval. Staff find that the applicant's proposed materials and overall footprint are appropriate, however, staff does not find the proposed roof form nor overall height of the addition

appropriate. Staff finds that with a modified roof form, the overall height of the addition as well as its massing may decrease and become appropriate.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to refer applicant to the DRC. Applicant presented new documents which have not been reviewed by staff.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Salas, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED**18. HDRC NO. 2016-048**

Applicant: Alyson Callison/210 Development Group

Address: 701 W Commerce

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to amend a previously approved Historic and Design Review Commission COA for the adaptive reuse of the historic structure located at 701 W Commerce, commonly known as both the Maureaux Building and Toudouze Market.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant received final approval for new construction of the Vitre Multi-family development on May 6, 2015, with the stipulations that the applicant study ways to further incorporate brick into the proposal, particularly brick that complements that of the Maureaux Building prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness and that the excavations meet all requirements for archaeology outlined in UDC Article 6, Sections 35-630-35-634, 35-675, and 35-606. On September 28, 2015, staff found that the proposed amount of brick is appropriate, meeting the first stipulation. Per the approval, the applicant had proposed in their application to keep the façade of the Maureaux building.
- b. To preserve the ornamental façade of the Maureaux building, the applicant proposed to locate a total of fourteen piers to stabilize the historic façade while its restoration and new construction were taking place. As of January 2016, the Texas Department of Transportation notified the applicant that seven of the proposed nine piers on the Pecos street façade were too close in proximity to Interstate Highway 35's support infrastructure and would not be approved.
- c. The Design Review Committee reviewed the current status of this project on January 26, 2016, where they questioned various other ideas of how to save the entire Pecos (east facing) façade, however, the applicant noted that due to proximity to the elevated highway, work could not be done from the exterior, nor interior due to site constraints and other structural issues. Committee members noted that the applicant should provide additional documentation regarding the above noted construction constraints and that the loss of the corner and Pecos (east facing) façade would be unfortunate.
- d. At this time, the applicant has proposed to preserve only the façade that faces E Commerce (south). A 12.8 foot portion at the corner of E Commerce and Pecos as well as a 120 foot portion along Pecos are the two façade portions that the applicant has proposed to remove. All of the 12.8 section of wall that faces the southeast as well as approximately 35 feet of a portion of the 120 foot Pecos (east) wall feature ornamentation consistent with that of the E Commerce façade. The applicant's proposal to preserve the E Commerce street appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines, however, staff finds that the applicant should preserve the 12.8 foot section of the ornamental wall that faces southeast at the corner of E Commerce and Pecos as well as the approximately 15 to 20 foot section of the east facing wall on Pecos that extends to the first IH-35 support column. Both sections feature ornamentation consistent with that on the E Commerce façade.
- e. Staff recommends the applicant develop a salvaging plan for the original brick along the Pecos (east) façade that will not be retained. Staff finds this brick should be reused in the project. Because this portion of the building is under the overpass and not very visible, staff finds that it may be more meaningful to incorporate the brick into other facades with more visibility. This should be provided to staff along with construction documents that note the preservation of all ornamental walls as mentioned in finding d prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the rehabilitation of the E Commerce (south) façade and that the applicant restore both wall

sections that resemble the E Commerce façade as noted in finding d. Additionally, staff finds that a salvaging plan be submitted for review that specifies the salvaging and reuse of brick from the section of wall that is to be removed throughout the new construction as noted in finding e.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve with staff stipulations.

AYES: Connor, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Salas, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

RECUSED: Guarino

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2015-249

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: 915 Castroville / Las Palmas Library

REQUEST:

The Office of Historic Preservation is requesting a Finding of Historic Significance for the property located at 915 Castroville.

FINDINGS:

a. A request for finding of historic significance for 915 Castroville was submitted by the Office of Historic Preservation.

b. The HDRC may recommend that the property is eligible for landmark designation without the consent of the property's owner. According to the UDC Section 35-607(a) & (b)(1), initiation of landmark designation cannot begin without owner consent, unless a City Council resolution to proceed with the designation has been approved. If 915 Castroville is found to be eligible for historic landmark designation and the property owner does not consent, the HDRC shall direct its secretary, the Historic Preservation Officer, to request a City Council resolution to proceed with the designation.

c. This case was heard on August 8th, 2015 by the HDRC who referred the case to the Designation & Demolition Committee. The committee made a site visit and found the structure eligible for designation.

d. Identified by the Westside Community as an important cultural resource. Built in 1969 and designed by local architect Paul Garcia on land adjacent to the Las Palmas Shopping Center, the community has articulated its importance as a gathering and meeting place, as a unique structure designed by Latino architect who was dedicated to serving the needs of the community, and as a reflection of the reverence for education and betterment felt by the community. The structure located at 915 Castroville was built in 1969 on land adjacent to the Las Palmas Shopping Center.

e. The owner is not in support of the designation.

f. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)5, the building is a unique mid-20th century institutional design;

g. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)6, the building is an architecturally significant mid-20th century building.

h. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)7, the structure's unusual design and prominent corner location within the Las Palmas Shopping Center complex create a visual landmark and anchor for the neighborhood.

i. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)8, the structure has high architectural integrity and is mostly intact.

j. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)11, the architecturally distinctive structure has served the Westside community for many years.

k. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)12, the structure is a very unique example a mid-20th century library.

l. The UDC requires that a property meet at least three of the designation criteria. This property meets six items from the criteria for designation (35-607)(b)5,6,7,8,11,12.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings c through l.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

Susan Beavin, Rachel Delgado, Antonia Castaneda, Graciela Esperaga, Ruben Solis, James Griffin (Owner Rep), all spoke in support of designation.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve designation.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Salas, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

Those listed spoke on Sustainability Measures

- Bianca Maldonado, Monticello Park Neighborhood Association
- Liz Franklin, Dignowity Hill
- Cotton Estes, Dignowity Hill
- Paul Kinnison, MVHA
- Shelbi Jary, King William
- Margo Preuost, King William
- Patrick Mcmillan, King William
- Frederica Kushner, Tobin Hill Community Association
- Anne Toxy, King William
- Sharron Brown, TXSPC

Approval of Meeting Minutes – February 3, 2016

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve February 3, 2016 minutes.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Salas, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair